

vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 954, CO-OP CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT OF 2016

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 893 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 893

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 954) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt from the individual mandate certain individuals who had coverage under a terminated qualified health plan funded through the Consumer Operated and Oriented Plan (CO-OP) program. All points of order against consider-

ation of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 893 provides for consideration of H.R. 954, the CO-OP Consumer Protection Act of 2016. The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided among the majority and minority of the Committee on Ways and Means. As is standard with all legislation pertaining to the Tax Code, the Committee on Rules made no further amendments in order; however, the rule affords the minority the customary motion to recommit.

Under the rule, we will be considering a bill to prevent a tax increase imposed on the American people by the Affordable Care Act. This will affect many Americans through no fault of their own and due to circumstances beyond their control. The bill advanced through regular order and was reported favorably out of the Committee on Ways and Means on a voice vote earlier this month.

The Affordable Care Act established a program to provide taxpayer-funded loans for Consumer Operated and Oriented Plan program, better known as the CO-OP program. The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services funded 24 CO-OPs in 23 States. Of those 24 CO-OPs, 1 failed before it ever enrolled a single individual, and just 6 remain open today. The 17 failed CO-OPs received over \$1.8 billion in taxpayer funds and, to date, none of those CO-OPs has paid back any of those loans.

In addition to wasting billions of taxpayer dollars, the CO-OPs have created instability and hardship for hundreds of thousands of individuals who relied on CO-OPs for insurance coverage. Under the Affordable Care Act, individ-

uals must be covered by a health plan that provides minimum essential coverage or pay a tax for failure to maintain coverage. Thus, victims of failed CO-OPs were penalized, despite their efforts to be in compliance with the law.

The magnitude of this problem for affected individuals is significant. They are left without coverage for health care. They face increased financial burdens and tax penalties. H.R. 954, the CO-OP Consumer Protection Act of 2016, would provide targeted relief by creating an exemption from the individual health insurance mandate for individuals who have coverage under a CO-OP that fails.

H.R. 954 would be effective retroactively, starting January 1, 2014, and would also protect consumers of the remaining six CO-OPS going forward. While the administration and some of my counterparts have noted that consumers affected by a close CO-OP could have purchased new plans during a special enrollment period, this comes up short. Those victims of failed CO-OPs had to start anew in paying deductibles for a new plan well into the coverage year, and continuity of care could be significantly disrupted, based on changes to provider networks.

H.R. 954 does not make these individuals whole, but it is the right thing to do. Across America, individuals do not even have the basic assurance that their insurance carrier will not simply vanish in the night. We should all be able to agree that these individuals should not also then face penalties under the individual mandate.

H.R. 954 advanced through regular order and was favorably reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Here we are again, Mr. Speaker, discussing a bill that, whatever its merits and noble intentions are, of course, of trying to hold harmless the victims of organizations that go out of business, will meet a veto.

The Statement of Administration Policy says, if the President were presented with H.R. 954, he would veto the bill. That is the strongest kind of veto message that we get. Sometimes they say his advisers say he might or he is going to consider it. It says he would veto it.

So here we are again, in the precious little time that this body has before it sends everybody back to their district, when we could be addressing Zika, when we could be addressing Flint, when we could be addressing immigration reform, when we could pass a balanced budget amendment, or any of those things that I hear from my constituents every day. Instead, we are pursuing a bill that won't become law.

This bill will not become law. The President has indicated he would veto

it. So we are just taking up the time of this body to debate a bill that affects people in a few States. Of course, I understand Iowa and Nebraska share one of the CO-OPs that went out of business. New York and Oregon are the others.

I hail from a State where the CO-OP went out of business. I would add that it went out of business, with the actions of State regulators, at the right time, namely, before the enrollment period.

So the question I brought before the Rules Committee yesterday, and I think it is very important for anybody who supports this bill to answer: Why did the State regulators in those States allow those CO-OPs to fail mid-period? Why weren't they ahead of the curve in those States to make sure that, if they had to fail, they did so in an orderly manner prior to the enrollment period? It is irresponsible of State regulators to allow insolvent plans into the marketplace.

Instead of discussing that and instead of launching an investigation into that, instead of having a GAO report on that, we are just doing a bill that effectively bails them out. Another Republican taxpayer bailout bill that we have before us today.

I have always been a big fan of the CO-OPs. In fact, the Consumer Operated and Oriented Plan program was created to support the development of nonprofit health insurance options in the individual marketplace. They face a lot of challenges. And, sadly, in fact, we wouldn't even be dealing with the fact that 17 of them have gone out of business if the Republicans hadn't put a provision in the omnibus in 2016—which I was proud to oppose for this reason, among many others—that defunded the healthcare CO-OPs.

So they already did an attack on the Affordable Care Act by defunding the CO-OPs; and now they are saying we want to bail them out. Of course, you want to bail them out now. You are responsible for letting them fail in the first place.

Look, there are a lot of questions to answer before this body moves forward with this failed Republican bailout bill, namely, where were the State regulators?

□ 1345

Why did they let these fail mid-cycle instead of, as they did in my State, before the enrollment period ended?

Number two, why did you defend them in the first place? Didn't you know that you would probably have to bail them out if you did?

And the third question I brought up in the Rules Committee is, why are we even just talking about CO-OPs? What about if for-profit insurance companies go out of business? Are we going to bail out those consumers, too?

Now, I haven't seen that that has happened yet, but, look, these are private companies; it is only a matter of time until some company makes bad

decisions and goes bankrupt and leaves its customers in the lurch.

Now, it is the job of State regulators to try to actuarially make sure that those companies are sound and solvent; and if they are going to disqualify one, to do so before the enrollment period, not midterm.

But let's be honest. Bad things happen, and probably someday a company will go out of business in the middle of a term, despite the best efforts of State regulators.

And what about those customers, and why would they be treated any differently than the customers of CO-OPs?

Look, in the three States where the CO-OPs did close down mid-session because of the ineffectiveness of State regulators, rather than proposing a Republican taxpayer bailout, we should simply point people to alternative insurance options. In fact, CO-OPs contacted every customer over 20 times to assist with the process of finding a new plan by e-mail, mailer, and phone. And in the event the available premiums were too expensive, the Affordable Care Act already has what they call a hardship exemption, where families can avoid paying any penalty. Just as they do under this bill, they can do it without this bill as well.

In the three instances where CO-OP plans were terminated in the middle of the year, the set of circumstances that this Republican taxpayer bailout bill is designed to address, it appears that individuals had ample time and options to find new coverage, even if their own State regulators were asleep at the switch, and it does not mean that the rest of us, that I have to go back to honest, hardworking Coloradans and say, sorry, you have to bail out the Republican Congress and their failure to include in the omnibus a plan to maintain the solvency of the CO-OPs.

The financial penalty for forgoing coverage is one of the primary incentives for what we call RomneyCare, or some call ObamaCare. By circumventing the individual mandate, H.R. 954 undermines an essential component of what was known as the Massachusetts plan, which is now the Affordable Care Act.

But as we know, over 20 million Americans have obtained health insurance, many for the first time. I am proud to say that in my home State of Colorado, while we have a number of issues with regard to the Affordable Care Act, one positive indicator that we can point to is that the rate of individuals without insurance has dropped by half. It is now a historically low 6.7 percent. It has never been that low in the history of Colorado. For Colorado children, the uninsured rate is even lower, 2.5 percent.

So nationwide, as we know, there are a lot of elements of the Affordable Care Act that are very popular and important to maintain. No one should be denied coverage for having a preexisting condition. Young adults can afford health insurance by staying on their parents' plan.

The individual mandate is the flip side of making sure that people aren't discriminated against because of pre-existing conditions. You can't have only a high-risk pool. You have to make sure that healthy people are in the pool to keep the rates low for everybody. That is the fundamental model that went into RomneyCare, and it was later adopted as a bipartisan concept.

In addition, individuals have access to preventative services, affordable prescription drugs, and are no longer subject to lifetime caps that can leave them bankrupt if they have a serious illness. I have heard from a number of constituents for whom that is very important.

So, look, every law can use improvement. There is no doubt about that. I was very strongly against the language in the Omnibus in 2016 that led to these CO-OPs going out of business and led to this Republican bailout package. And the Affordable Care Act, of course, can be improved.

So instead of discussing ways to roll back the successes of the Affordable Care Act or do massive bailouts, we should be discussing ways that we can make the law work better and prevent the need for bailouts moving forward.

To this end, I, along with many of my colleagues, have been a long-time supporter of establishing a public health insurance plan option. A public health insurance plan option would go a long way to revitalizing the individual marketplace through increased competition.

In 2010, I led an effort with my colleague from Maine, Representative CHELLIE PINGREE, to encourage Senator REID to consider a public option in the health care reform legislation that was being drafted. And I have continued to call for a public option even after the Affordable Care Act passed. It has been scored to have reduced the deficit by over \$200 billion and it would help the constituents in my district, particularly in our mountain areas, by providing a more affordable option within the individual exchange.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of Representative SCHAKOWSKY's H.R. 265, the Public Option Deficit Reduction Act, which would require HHS to set up a public health insurance option. I would point out that this Republican bailout plan increases the deficit. Right? Small amount, small amount.

You have the figures, my friend from Texas. I think—was it \$40 million? How much does this bill increase the deficit? 12 million?

Very small amount, right; but still the wrong way.

The plan that I am supporting and that many Democrats support would reduce the deficit by \$200 billion.

So if the Republicans continue to go down this road of bailouts, large and small, we are going to bankrupt this country. We are already \$20 trillion in debt. We have a deficit of half a trillion dollars. Yes, every little bit matters.

Again, the amount is small of this Republican bailout that increases the deficit; but we could be going another path which is fiscally responsible, increases consumer choice, and brings down costs.

Furthermore, since this bill will be vetoed anyway and this isn't going to become law, it is hardly worth the time to discuss. What we should be talking about are the very real public health crises. Indeed, public health, health-related bill, let's talk about health.

Let's talk about the fact that it has been over a year since Flint administrators first became aware of toxic levels of lead in the water of the city, which still exist; and over that time the body has sat on its hands, day after day, week after week. Exposure to lead is very harmful to children who are at significantly elevated risk of damage to their nervous system, learning disabilities, impaired development, that not only are crises for them and their families, but ultimately will cost taxpayers even more over time. Yet, Congress hasn't allocated any help to even replace the pipes in Flint while children in the community are still using bottled water to drink and bathe, at great expense, I might add.

Bottled water, for those of you who drink bottled water—Mr. Speaker, I don't know if you do—you know it is quite expensive, right?

Better to drink water out of your tap. Let's fix the underlying condition.

Then, of course, we have the Zika crisis. Nineteen thousand Americans have contracted the virus so far this year; 1,800 of those Americans are pregnant women who have an elevated risk of having associated consequences for their children, including microcephaly. Funding is essential to reduce the building diagnostic backlog and develop a method of testing, a vaccination, and better ways to address this health crisis as it spreads across Florida, south Texas, and the Caribbean.

But instead of debating Zika or Flint or even a continuing resolution to keep the government open past Friday—which we haven't spent a moment on yet even though Government funding runs out Friday—or a bipartisan balanced budget amendment or any of the other great ideas that have been brought forward in a bipartisan way, instead of doing any of that, a symbolic bill will be met by a veto, yet another Republican bailout that costs taxpayers and increases the deficit.

We have a bill that does nothing, that won't become law. It is a part of a wider effort to increase the deficit and force hardworking taxpayers in Colorado to bail out the failures of State regulators in four States.

Mr. Speaker, this bill adds to the deficit. It undermines a component of the Affordable Care Act. It doesn't even address the failure of State regulators. It doesn't even address the fact that a policy that Republicans put in the 2016 Omnibus has led to the need for this bailout. Simply put, this is not part of the solution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the bipartisan no fly, no buy legislation. It would allow the Attorney General to bar the sale of explosives and firearms to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

Republicans have refused to act on this commonsense legislation. Some of you might have heard at the debate yesterday that both Presidential contenders from both parties support this legislation. It is common sense.

If we don't let somebody fly on an airplane, if they are on the terrorist watch list, why would we let them quietly assemble an arsenal?

We need to check it out. Of course, if they are wrongly put on that list, of course let's have a way to get them off that list right away. So if they have a legitimate reason to buy a gun and they are not a terrorist, they shouldn't be on that list. But not buying a gun is the least of their inconveniences. If they are on that list, they can't even fly in most cases.

Yet, Republicans continue to fail to act on this commonsense legislation despite being supported by Donald Trump, by Hillary Clinton, by many other leaders of both parties.

We have the opportunity, if I can defeat the previous question with this vote, to actually take action and close this glaring loophole that allows terrorists to buy firearms and explosives right now in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, again, rather than have this Republican bailout bill that increases the deficit, we could be discussing making it harder for terrorists to buy explosives and assemble arsenals. Okay?

That is the choice we have in this vote. It is a choice I am willing to make, Mr. Speaker. It is a choice that every Member will be called upon to make when they vote "yea" and they say, Let's do a bailout that increases the deficit, or they vote "nay" and join me and say, You know what, let's make it harder for terrorists to buy explosives and firearms, a policy supported by both Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton.

That is the choice we will have in moments, and it is one I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to think deeply about before they cast their "yes" vote or before they cast their "no" vote.

Mr. Speaker, we have three calendar days left in this fiscal year, and our limited legislative time is not being spent well. We could be devoting our last few days to addressing Zika, to making it harder for terrorists to assemble arsenals, to addressing the disaster in Flint, Michigan, to stem the tide of opioid addiction ravaging this country and so many families that I have heard from in Colorado.

None of these public health crises will be addressed if we don't consider a bill to keep the government open beyond September 30; instead, we are considering yet another Republican bailout—increases the deficit, unnecessary, and lets State regulators off the hook, bails them out.

H.R. 954 implements an unnecessary, uncalled-for exemption, distracts us from the real conversations we should be having about how we can make health care more affordable and how we can reduce our budget deficit. This bill is simply an irresponsible process. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First off, just to correct the record, I was asked about the budgetary effect of this bill, and it is negative \$4 million over the next 10 years.

Congress did not defund the CO-OPs. The risk corridor program that was passed by this Congress in 2010, associated with the Affordable Care Act, was never fully funded in the first place.

This bill under our consideration today does not bail out anyone. It does not bail out the CO-OPs. It eliminates a penalty—a penalty imposed on consumers who did everything they could to comply with the law known as the individual mandate under the Affordable Care Act.

Look, if I ran the zoo, I would get rid of the individual mandate tomorrow. These individuals, under the individual mandate, covered by insurance which they were forced to purchase, and then goes bankrupt, through no fault of their own, they are going to get penalized for not having coverage. It is almost Kafkaesque in its design.

State legislators have virtually no control over the CO-OPs. Control of the business model is completely centralized within the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. The CO-OP model was fundamentally unsound from the start, another example of this administration's propensity to conduct dangerous experiments with our Nation's health care. Yet, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services has continued to stand in the way of the flexibility that the co-ops actually need to become fiscally sustainable.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of this important bill to provide relief for a tax increase looming over Americans who tried, tried, and tried to follow the rules of the Affordable Care Act and, yet, have

been let down by this administration's failed policies.

I certainly thank Mr. SMITH on the Ways and Means Committee for proposing this legislation and shepherding it through the committee process.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 893 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a

vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 893, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 892; and

Adoption of House Resolution 892, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 176, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 559]

YEAS—244

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis

Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz

Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Eilmlers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)

Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom

Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—176

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy

Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett

Doyle, Michael
F.
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda

Hoyer	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky	Garrett	Loudermilk	Rooney (FL)	McDermott	Rangel	Takano
Huffman	Matsui	Schiff	Gibbs	Love	Ros-Lehtinen	McGovern	Rice (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Israel	McCollum	Schrader	Gibson	Lucas	Roskam	McNerney	Richmond	Thompson (MS)
Jackson Lee	McDermott	Scott (VA)	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer	Ross	Meeks	Roybal-Allard	Titus
Jeffries	McGovern	Scott, David	Goodlatte	Lummis	Rothfus	Meng	Ruiz	Tonko
Johnson (GA)	McNerney	Serrano	Gosar	MacArthur	Rouzer	Moore	Ruppersberger	Torres
Johnson, E. B.	Meeks	Sewell (AL)	Gowdy	Marchant	Royce	Moulton	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas
Kaptur	Meng	Sherman	Granger	Marino	Russell	Murphy (FL)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Van Hollen
Keating	Moore	Sinema	Graves (GA)	Massie	Salmon	Nadler	Sarbanes	Vargas
Kelly (IL)	Moulton	Sires	Graves (LA)	McCarthy	Sanford	Napolitano	Schakowsky	Veasey
Kennedy	Murphy (FL)	Slaughter	Graves (MO)	McCaul	Scalise	Neal	Schiff	Vela
Kildee	Nadler	Smith (WA)	Griffith	McClintock	Schweikert	Nolan	Schrader	Velázquez
Kilmer	Napolitano	Smith (CA)	Grothman	McHenry	Scott, Austin	Norcross	Scott (VA)	Visclosky
Kind	Neal	Swalwell (CA)	Guinta	McKinley	Sensenbrenner	O'Rourke	Scott, David	Walz
Kirkpatrick	Nolan	Takano	Guthrie	McMorris	Sessions	Pallone	Serrano	Wasserman
Kuster	Norcross	Thompson (CA)	Hanna	Rodgers	Shimkus	Perlmutter	Sewell (AL)	Schultz
Largevin	O'Rourke	Thompson (MS)	Hardy	McSally	Shuster	Peters	Sherman	Waters, Maxine
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Titus	Harper	Meadows	Simpson	Peterson	Sinema	Watson Coleman
Larson (CT)	Pascrell	Tonko	Harris	Meehan	Smith (MO)	Pingree	Sires	Welch
Lawrence	Perlmutter	Torres	Hartzler	Messer	Smith (NE)	Pocan	Slaughter	Wilson (FL)
Lee	Peters	Tsongas	Heck (NV)	Mica	Smith (NJ)	Polis	Smith (WA)	Yarmuth
Levin	Pingree	Van Hollen	Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)	Price (NC)	Swalwell (CA)	
Lewis	Pocan	Vargas	Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)	Stefanik	Quigley		
Lieu, Ted	Polis	Veasey	Hice, Jody B.	Moolenaar	Stewart			
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Velázquez	Hill	Mooney (WV)	Stivers			
Loeb sack	Quigley	Visclosky	Holding	Mullin	Stutzman	Beatty	Payne	Sanchez, Loretta
Lofgren	Rangel	Walz	Hudson	Mulvaney	Thompson (PA)	Duckworth	Pelosi	Speier
Lowenthal	Rice (NY)	Wasserman	Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)	Thornberry	Hinojosa	Poe (TX)	Westmoreland
Lowey	Richmond	Schultz	Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer		Pascrell	Rush	
Lujan Grisham	Roybal-Allard	Waters, Maxine	Hultgren	Newhouse				
(NM)	Ruiz	Watson Coleman	Hunter	Noem				
Luján, Ben Ray	Ruppersberger	Welch	Hurd (TX)	Nugent				
(NM)	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (FL)	Hurt (VA)	Nunes				
Lynch	Sánchez, Linda T.	Yarmuth	Issa	Olson				
Maloney,	Sarbanes		Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo				
Carolyn			Jenkins (WV)	Palmer				
			Johnson (OH)	Paulsen				
			Johnson, Sam	Pearce				
			Jolly	Perry				
			Jones	Pittenger				
			Jordan	Pitts				
			Joyce	Poliquin				
			Katko	Pompeo				
			Kelly (MS)	Posey				
			Kelly (PA)	Price, Tom				
			King (IA)	Ratcliffe				
			King (NY)	Reed				
			Kinzinger (IL)	Reichert				
			Kline	Renacci				
			Knight	Ribble				
			Labrador	Rice (SC)				
			LaHood	Rigell				
			LaMalfa	Roby				
			Lamborn	Roe (TN)				
			Lance	Rogers (AL)				
			Latta	Rogers (KY)				
			LoBiondo	Rohrabacher				
			Long	Rokita				

NOT VOTING—11

Beatty	Payne	Sanchez, Loretta
Duckworth	Pelosi	Speier
Granger	Poe (TX)	Westmoreland
Hinojosa	Rush	

□ 1422

Messrs. LARSEN of Washington, MURPHY of Florida, and AL GREEN of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTHFUS). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 177, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 560]

YEAS—243

Abraham	Buck	Davis, Rodney
Aderholt	Bucshon	Denham
Allen	Burgess	Dent
Amash	Byrne	DeSantis
Amodei	Calvert	DesJarlais
Babin	Carter (GA)	Diaz-Balart
Barletta	Carter (TX)	Dold
Barr	Chabot	Donovan
Barton	Chaffetz	Duffy
Benishek	Clawson (FL)	Duncan (SC)
Bilirakis	Coffman	Duncan (TN)
Bishop (MI)	Cole	Ellmers (NC)
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Emmer (MN)
Black	Collins (NY)	Farenthold
Blackburn	Comstock	Fincher
Blum	Conaway	Fitzpatrick
Bost	Cook	Fleischmann
Boustany	Costello (PA)	Fleming
Brady (TX)	Cramer	Flores
Brat	Crawford	Forbes
Bridenstine	Crenshaw	Fortenberry
Brooks (AL)	Culberson	Fox
Brooks (IN)	Curbelo (FL)	Franks (AZ)
Buchanan	Davidson	Frelinghuysen

NAYS—177

Adams	Cuellar
Aguilar	Cummings
Ashford	Davis (CA)
Bass	Davis, Danny
Becerra	DeFazio
Bera	DeGette
Beyer	Delaney
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro
Blumenauer	DelBene
Bonamici	DeSaulnier
Boyle, Brendan F.	Deutch
Brady (PA)	Dingell
Brown (FL)	Doggett
Brownley (CA)	Doyle, Michael F.
Bustos	Edwards
Butterfield	Ellison
Capps	Engel
Capuano	Eshoo
Cardenas	Esty
Carney	Farr
Carson (IN)	Foster
Cartwright	Frankel (FL)
Castor (FL)	Fudge
Castro (TX)	Gabbard
Chu, Judy	Gallego
Cioccine	Garamendi
Clark (MA)	Graham
Clarke (NY)	Grayson
Clay	Green, Al
Cleaver	Green, Gene
Clyburn	Grijalva
Cohen	Gutiérrez
Connolly	Hahn
Conyers	Hastings
Cooper	Heck (WA)
Costa	Higgins
Courtney	Himes
Crowley	Honda

Hoyer	McCollum
Huffman	McGovern
Israel	McNerney
Jackson Lee	Meeks
Jeffries	Meng
Johnson (GA)	Moore
Johnson, E. B.	Moulton
Kaptur	Murphy (FL)
Keating	Nadler
Kelly (IL)	Napolitano
Kennedy	Neal
Kildee	Nolan
Kilmer	Norcross
Kind	O'Rourke
Kirkpatrick	Pallone
Kuster	Perlmutter
Langevin	Peters
Larsen (WA)	Peterson
Larson (CT)	Pingree
Lawrence	Pocan
Lee	Polis
Levin	Price (NC)
Lewis	Quigley
Lieu, Ted	
Lipinski	
Loeb sack	
Lofgren	
Lowenthal	
Lowey	
Lujan Grisham	
(NM)	
Luján, Ben Ray	
(NM)	
Lynch	
Maloney,	
Carolyn	
Maloney, Sean	
Matsui	
McCollum	

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5303, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2016; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 892) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5303) to provide for improvements to the rivers and harbors of the United States, to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 178, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 561]

YEAS—243

Abraham	Barton	Bost
Aderholt	Benishek	Boustany
Allen	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Amash	Bishop (MI)	Brat
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Bridenstine
Babin	Black	Brooks (AL)
Barletta	Blackburn	Brooks (IN)
Barr	Blum	Buchanan

□ 1430

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.